

MEMORANDUM FOR: Colonel White

SUBJECT : Notes on Agenda for Career Service Board

1. Items 1, 2, and 3 include respectively, minutes of last meeting, appointment of Board member to replace Sherman Kent, and Chairman's report of steering Committee's work.

25X1A

2. Item 4 of the Agenda is a staff study proposal submitted to the Board by [] that the present system of rotation slots be abolished and a new device called "Career Development Slots" be substituted. The principal difference would be that whereas a precise number of "rotation" slots are assigned to each Agency office (ranging from 1 to 5 depending on size of office), under the new plan a "career development slot" would be formally granted to offices upon justification of need. Such justification would be external training of an employee under PL 110 (in which case the Director of Training will recommend to the Career Service Board whether a "career development slot" should be given the office) or inter-office rotation (in which case the AD/P would recommend to the Board whether a career development slot should be given the office from which the employee is rotated.) The purpose of the new slots would be the same as the old rotation slots, namely to encourage offices to engage in development activities for their personnel by letting them fill the positions occupied by personnel selected for such development. In other words, while employees were absent from their jobs, they would be shunted aside to a "career development slot" and the vacancy created in the position they previously occupied could be filled. The new plan provides for the career development slot to go out of existence upon termination of the training or other program which provided the basis for its creation. This is unlike the "rotation" slots which remained permanently with the office. Rud claims that many offices have not used the "rotation" slots, and that some have abused them as a means to get extra T/O. If there has been the widespread misunderstanding that Rud claims, it would seem to be his fault for not having cleared up the confusion on the part of the various office boards. Also his disappointment that more use of them has not been made during the first year should be tempered with the realization that many of the Boards are just getting down to doing worthwhile development work.

I think that the new plan represents quite an improvement, but think that everyone should realize that the process of separately creating a new "career development slot" whenever a development program is arranged for an employee will create considerably more paperwork than the present arrangement which provides for a set figure assigned to each office.

3. Item 5 reflects a long background of disagreement among various Agency offices. It all started with General Smith asking the AD/P to draw up a proposal for giving oral examinations to all Agency personnel prior to EOD. The Personnel Office study on this subject was referred to the Panel by the Board. The Panel declined to comment on the study, however, and informed the Board that it believed

that certain basic changes were needed in overall Agency personnel policy before it would suggest anything on refining selection methods. The principal change suggested was a two year trial service period, at the end of which time a "special" selection procedure would be applied to decide whether the employee should be retained. Although the "special" procedure was not defined, it was generally agreed that a panel should orally interview all such persons for personal evaluation. The Panel's report was met with strong opposition by many operating offices, so that the Board at its last meeting instructed the Panel to get specific about the "special procedures." The Chairman of the Panel distributed the draft of a suggested reply among Panel members. Immediately so much opposition developed among the Panel that at a meeting recently it was decided to refer the question to the Personnel Office in order to obtain assistance from that office with respect to the question of what means might be proposed to improve selection. It is emphasized that the draft paper was shelved by the Panel. Yet it now shows up in the agenda in a transmittal from the Chairman [] because, he says "it was felt that the Career Service Board could assist the Panel considerably by commenting. . . . on the paper."

25X1A

25X1A

[] has informed me that Kirkpatrick has now decided to consider it not an "information" paper but an "action" paper, and he will take up each item and get a Board vote thereon.

The main items are:

a. New employees will have a "provisional" (same as trail or probational) appointment; for professional personnel it will be two years, for other, one year.

b. The Professional Selection Panel will be replaced by a CIA Selection Board, composed of one voting member from each of the five components.

c. All data developed about an applicant shall be put into the personnel folder, unless it is sensitive security or medical data.

The Security Office strongly opposes this as wholly inconsistent with their operating requirements.

d. Before EOD'ing any new employee, his folder will be reviewed by an Examiner selected from a Panel established by the new CIA Selection Board. The purpose of this is the feeling that it is essential "in the process of selecting applicants for professional positions, that the decision as to overall suitability be reviewed by a responsible officer outside the requesting component. Such an officer is less likely to be biased by the pressure of personnel shortages in the office concerned." Where the Examiner doubted the suitability of an applicant, the case would be referred to the CIA Selection Board. The Board's decision would be final, unless appeal were made to the DCI. This procedure, of course, pyramids review on review and gives a staff body the authorities which should exist only in command channels.

e. An Examining Committee of three people selected from a Panel maintained by the CIA Selection Board would review the record of each professional employee just before he completed his "provisional" service. The Committee makes recommendations to the Office Career Service Board which, if it disagrees, may "refer the case to the CIA Selection Board, whose decision in the case shall be

final, subject only to review by the DCI." Again this reflects the passion to pull administrative functions out of the command line and into areas where no real accountability can be enforced.

25X1A I want to repeat, however, that this paper has been bootlegged into the agenda and that the majority of the Panel did not wish this done. However, [] has felt so keenly about the need to place certain personnel functions outside of regular command lines that I am certain he engineered this particular operation.

25X1A 4. Item 6 of the agenda is [] report of progress in behalf of the insurance task force. He recommends retaining the Wyatt Company of Washington to make a thorough actuarial survey of the Agency's situation at a cost of \$2,000.

5. The last item involves legislation. [] tells me that some people on the Board feel that General Counsel has been wholly indifferent to this aspect of the Career Service Program, and that these people say its about time to take the matter out of General Counsel's hands and give it to a Task Force which presumably will tell General Counsel what to do. Accordingly, this item proposes just such a task force. In a memorandum to the Board (included in the agenda) [] reviews the status of legislative projects proposed by the old Career Service Committee a year ago:

25X1A

- | | | |
|-------|---|---|
| 25X1A | a. Added benefits for disability incurred in CIA service. | - No action |
| | b. Pay benefits for detained personnel | - Missing Persons Act gave temporary benefits which will expire in February 1954. |
| | c. Injury compensation for dependents | -No action. |
| | d. Six month's death gratuity | - No action. |
| | e. Liberalized retirement | - Congress now studying on overall basis. |
| | f. Home leave for overseas employees | - Referred to General Counsel by Personnel. |

25X1A 6. In addition [] reviewed various bills now considered by Congress which include subjects such as simplifying dual compensation laws, severance pay, supervisory selection, incentive awards, etc.

25X1A 7. [] also reviewed "other problems" which should go into a legislative program:

- a. Exemption of CIA from the 1950 Performance Evaluation Act.
- b. Hardship posts.
- c. Twenty-four Hour Duty concept.

- d. Reduction in Force.
- e. Medical Benefits to Groups not now covered.
- f. Insurance.
- g. Authority for CIA appointments.

On this latter point Rud says that the possibility that Schedule A jobs may be thrown into Schedule C (political patronage) makes it necessary to clarify our legal status. This is downright foolish. CIA gets its appointment authority from PL 110 and not Schedule A (although from 1947 to 1949 we were in Schedule A.) He says we may need legislation "to provide CIA employees with benefits and career status which are at least comparable to those of the Career Civil Service." This is absolute hogwash, since we have every conceivable administrative authority (from legislation) to formulate a CIA Career status in the same sense as the Atomic Energy Commission, TVA, and Federal Reserve Board—all of which are similarly exempt from Civil Service. These other agencies have built up enviable records of "career status" for their personnel, in many respects far surpassing the "benefits and career status" of the regular Civil Service.

25X1A

SA/DDA:DCK:djm(1 July 53)

DD/A Chrono.

MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

missing attachment